IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED:27.06.2006

CORAM:

THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE P. SATHASIVAM
AND
THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE V. DHANAPALAN

WRIT APPEAL NO.762 of 2006

and WAMP.No.1 of 2006

R. Krishna Kumar
rep. by his Power of Agent
Mr. D. Kothandan. .. Appellant/Petitioner

vs.

1. The District collector
   Chennai District
   Chennai 600 004.

2. The Tahsildar
   Mylapore-Triplicane Taluk
   Chennai 28. .. Respondents/Respondents

Writ Appeal filed under Clause 15 of the Letters of Patent against the order of the learned Judge Mr. Justice Elipe Dharma Rao, dated 24.04.2006 made in W.P.No.2 of 2006.presented to this Court under article 226 of the Constitutionl of India to issue a writ of Mandamus directing the responents to carry out the mutation of revenue records in favour of the petitioner in so far as his lands in Survey No. 1362, 1363, 1364, 1379, 1381 and 1382.

WEB COPY

For appellant : Ms. R.T. Shyamala

For respondents : Mr.J. Raja Kalifulla
Government Pleader

https://hcservices.ecourts.gov.in/hcservices/

JUDGMENT

(Judgement of the Court was delivered by P. SATHASIVAM,J.)

On direction, learned Government Pleader takes notice for the respondents.

2. The above writ appeal is directed against the order of the learned single Judge dated 24.04.2006 made in Writ Petition No.2 of 2006.

3. On going through the relief prayed for in the writ petition, proceedings of the District Collector dated 23.11.2000 and the order of the learned Judge, we are of the view that absolutely there is no ground for entertaining the above appeal. In fact the learned Judge in para 4 of his order directed the District Collector, Chennai to enquire into the matter as per the representation of the petitioner/appellant dated 20.01.2003 and pass appropriate orders in accordance with law. Though the learned counsel for the appellant claims that the order of the District Collector, Chennai dated 23.11.2000 is in favour of the appellant, in spite of the same, the Officers working under the first respondent are not implementing the same, we are of the view that it is for the petitioner / appellant to highlight the same before the District Collector, Chennai, if the same order subsists as on date. It is further made clear that the petitioner/appellant is free to move the District Collector, Chennai by way of further representation, if need arise.

With the above observation, this appeal is dismissed. No costs. Consequently, connected MP., is also dismissed.

kh

Sd/
Asst.Registrar

/true copy/

Sub Asst.Registrar

WEB COPY

https://hcservices.ecourts.gov.in/hcservices/

To

1. The District collector
   Chennai District
   Chennai 600 004.

2. The Tahsildar
   Mylapore-Triplicane Taluk
   Chennai 28.

+ one cc to the Government Pleader sr no. 27078
+ one cc to Ms. R.T. Shyamala, Advocate sr no. 27300

NG(CO)
NM(04.07.2006)

Writ Appeal No.762 of 2006

WEB COPY

https://hcservices.ecourts.gov.in/hcservices/